

Application No.: 09/994,915Docket No.: 30005991-02 US (1509-247)**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 16-17 are pending. Claims 11-15 have been withdrawn. Claim 1 is amended to specify that the "second" device is an output device instructed to join the session in order to output for the user at least some of the content provided via the interfacing handler from the content server. The dependent claims have been amended to correspond to the language of amended claim 1. Independent claims 1, 11, 14, 16-17 and claims dependent thereon are similarly amended.

The Examiner asserts that claims 1-4, 5-6, 8-10, 16 and 17 are obvious with respect to Pennock (U.S. 6,807,652) in view of Ogdon (U.S. 6,598,075). The arguments advanced by the Examiner are clearly deficient.

The Examiner has used Pennock to show the setting up of a chat room by a user, the user being able to invite other parties into the chat room by sending them the user's IP address. Although the chat room users appear to be in a common session, there is no disclosure in the passages of Pennock cited by the Examiner of:

- the provisions of content/content references to participants in the session from a content server via an interfacing handler;

- the instruction of an output device to join the session to provide content output for the initial user.

Ogdon discloses the use of a firewall to provide security for web servers of a corporation. The Examiner argues that it would be obvious to protect the chat room host of Pennock with a

Application No.: 09/994,915Docket No.: 30005991-02 US (1509-247)

firewall. Applicant fails to see how such a combination produces something falling within the scope of claim 1. The Examiner appears to be equating the firewall of Ogdon with the interfacing handler of claim 1; in this case, since claim 1 requires the user to interact with the content server via the interfacing handler. In order to render claim 1 obvious, the combination of Pennock and Ogdon would need to produce an arrangement in which the chat host (user device) interacted with a content server via a firewall with served content being passed by the firewall to participants in the chat room. However, such an arrangement is not provided by the combination of Pennock and Ogdon. Although, Ogdon does disclose a content server, there is no suggestion that the content server is being accessed by communications managed as a communication session so that participants in the session can receive served content.

Furthermore, neither Pennock or Ogdon shows the feature of amended claim 1 by which the device passes the session-joining information is an output device for outputting for the user at least some of the content served by the content server. The present claimed subject is concerned with joining output devices to a session of user interaction with a content server in order to enhance the content output capabilities available to the user. In contrast, the prior art systems are concerned with multiple independent parties (in Pennock, these are the chat room participants whereas in Ogdon these are the presentation recipients).


Applicants also take issue with the Examiner's arguments with respect to claim 5. Claim 5 provides that the interfacing handler "is a browser arranged to interpret pages with markup tags provided by the content server". The Examiner has argued that it would be obvious for the firewall of Ogdon to interpret pages with markup tags-so far as I am aware, firewalls never do this as it is not part of their function to interpret content. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not conceive of doing this-the Examiner's argument is purely speculative.

Application No.: 09/994,915**Docket No.: 30005991-02 US (1509-247)**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
Marianne HICKEY et al.


Randy A. Noranbrock
Registration No. 42,940

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Telephone: 703-684-1111
Facsimile: 970-898-0640
Date: September 29, 2005
AML/RAN/iyr